

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 8 - 10, 14 - 16, 18, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over publication number US2002/0120716 (hereinafter referred to as "Raghunathan") in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,930,764 (hereinafter referred to as "Melchione") and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,878,415 (hereinafter referred to as "Olds"). The Examiner also rejected claims 11 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olds in view of Publication Number US2002/0104018 (hereinafter referred to as "Singhani"). The Applicant respectfully traverses each of the Examiner's rejections and submits the following arguments in favor of patentability.

Claims 8 - 11 and 14

In claim 8, the Applicant recites a method for presenting address information to accessing parties in a shared directory environment. The method includes detecting a query from at least one entity over a data network seeking a first view of at least one address entry in the shared directory and retrieving identification information for the at least one entity. The identification information includes hierarchal information associated with the at least one entity. The method also includes denying access to the first view and, based upon the hierarchal information, searching the shared directory to identify all of the at least one address entries in the directory which include the hierarchal information. The method also includes presenting to the at least one entity initiating a query only all of the identified at least one address entries in the second view.

The Examiner states that Raghunathan teaches all of the elements of claim 8 except for denying access to the first view based on the hierarchal information; but, Melchione discloses the element of denying access to the first view based on the hierarchal information at 17, lines 1 - 5 and Olds discloses the address entry in a shared directory in a shared directory at column 1, line 67. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

First, Raghunathan does not teach detecting a query from at least one entity over a data network seeking a first view of at least one address entry in a shared directory. The Examiner states that such is taught at paragraph 13 of Raghunathan; but, here,

Raghunathan only teaches an application server responds to requests for applications that are stored therein. An application as defined in Raghunathan generally relates to software application programs and functions. *See* paragraph 10 of Raghunathan. Raghunathan may detect requests for applications; however, Raghunathan does not teach detecting requests for a first view of at least one address entry in the shared directory as the Applicant claims. The invention cited in the Applicant's claims may be used to deliver applications that Raghunathan teaches such that the applications are delivered to authorized people. However, Raghunathan does not teach detecting a request for a first view of an address entry.

An address entry of the Applicant's claims generally relates to information pertaining to a person's name, company, location, and/or e-mail address. *See e.g.*, page 6 of the present application. The Applicant claims a method for presenting address information to accessing parties. Raghunathan does not teach the presentation of any type of address information to an accessing party. The Examiner states that such is taught in Olds at column 1, line 67. This single line of the entire reference merely mentions the words e-mail address and net address.

The Applicant maintains that the Examiner's statement that Olds teaches an address entry in a shared directory based on two simple address types within one line of an entire reference is impermissible hindsight because the Examiner is clearly picking and choosing isolated disclosures among multiple references to state that a particular claim element is taught. *See e.g.*, *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1075 (C.A.Fed., 1988) (stating "One cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention"); *see also*, MPEP § 2143.03. The Applicant reminds the Examiner that when determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under § 103 is not whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious. *See e.g.*, *Schenck v. Nortron Corp.*, 713 F.2d 782, 218 (Fed.Cir. 1983); *see also*, MPEP § 2141.02.

In this regard, Raghunathan further does not teach retrieving identification information for the at least one entity making such a request for at least one address entry. The Examiner states that such is taught at column 17 of Raghunathan. While

Raghunathan states nothing about retrieving identification information for an entity seeking a first view of at least one address entry, Raghunathan appears, here, to only teach a priority scheme that allows employees to access data and system resources depending on their position in a hierarchical layer. But, nowhere does Raghunathan teach or reasonably suggest retrieving identification information.

More particularly, Raghunathan does not teach or reasonably suggest denying access to the first view. The Examiner states that such is taught, however, by Melchione at column 16, lines 65 - 67 and column 17, lines 1 - 5. Here, Melchione only teaches a simple login process where a user enters an ID and a password to restrict user access to a database, a process that is comparable to almost any network operating system. Aside from the fact that Melchione provides no motivation to combine (i.e. because Melchione is directed to a sales and marketing database whereas Raghunathan is directed to an application server), Melchione does not teach denying access to a first view of at least one address entry as the Applicant claims. The first view as stated hereinabove is the view of at least one address entry. While such information may indeed be important to an organization, the Examiner's referenced column of Melchione only states that "since financial institutions work with highly confidential and valuable information, it is necessary to restrict the access". If Melchione teaches anything at this reference, it regards financial information; but Melchione does not the address entries of the Applicant claims.

Still, Raghunathan does not teach or reasonably suggest searching a shared directory to identify *all* of the at least one address entries in the directory which include the hierarchal information. The Examiner states that such is taught at paragraph 13 of Raghunathan. Here, again, Raghunathan teaches an application server that responds to requests for applications that are stored therein. Raghunathan mentions managing requests for the applications but does not teach or reasonably suggest searching a shared directory to identify *all* entries in the directory. Once again, the address entries of the Applicant's claims generally regard information pertaining to a person's name, company, location, and/or e-mail address. The Applicant maintains that Olds cannot be used to supplement Raghunathan in terms of address entries because such is impermissible hindsight. Regardless, Olds and Raghunathan provide no reasonable suggestion to

combine because, among other reasons, Raghunathan is directed to delivering software applications to an enterprise whereas Olds is directed to controlling access to objects in a hierarchical database that are analogous to object-oriented programming objects - not software applications. In fact, Olds only uses the word application once in the entire reference and that in no way refers to a software application as is known to those skilled in the art. See e.g., column 9, lines 1 - 2 of Olds.

Moreover, nowhere does Raghunathan teach presenting to the at least one entity initiating the query only all of the identified at least one address entries in a second view. The Examiner states that such is taught at paragraph 17 of Raghunathan. First of all, Raghunathan does not even mention a first view let alone a second view. Nor does Raghunathan teach or reasonably suggest presenting address entries particularly because Raghunathan delivers software applications to entities that Olds is insufficient at supplementing.

For the reasons described herein above, the Applicant maintains that claim 8 is novel and nonobvious in view of the cited references. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 8. Since claims 9 - 14 depend from independent claim 8 and inherit all of the novel and nonobvious features of the independent claim, these claims are also novel and nonobvious. However, these claims recite additional features that further distinguish from the cited references. For example, claim 9 states that the shared directory is configurable for supporting emessaging. The Examiner, once again, points to the one-line/two-word reference in Olds (i.e., column 1, line 67) to state that all of the references combined support emessaging. The Applicant finds it hard to believe that the singular use of the words "e-mail address" *in only one of the three references* is intended to read upon a shared directory that supports emessaging. In fact, the Applicant maintains that such is not suggestive of support for emessaging. The emessaging of the Applicant's claims is e-mail wherein parties may access a common directory over the data network – not just an email address listed in some directory. See e.g., page 5, line 23 and page 6, line 1. For at least these reasons, the Applicant maintains that claim 9 is also novel and nonobvious in view of the cited references. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 9.

Claim 11 is another example of patentable distinction over the cited references. For example, in claim 11, the Applicant recites that the hierarchal information includes at least one of a company name and a company location. The Examiner resorts to the Singhani reference to support his rejection stating that Singhani teaches hierarchal information that includes at least one of the company name and a company location at paragraph 57. Once again, the Examiner is picking and choosing isolated disclosures from multiple references to deprecate the claimed invention; such is impermissible hindsight. The Applicant maintains that claim 11 is novel and nonobvious in view of the cited references, either alone or in combination. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 11.

Claim 14 is another example of patentable distinction over the cited references. In claim 14, the Applicant recites that the first view is a listing of all entries in the directory and the second view is a copy of the listing with modified selection criteria. The Examiner states that all three references combined teach every element of the Applicant's claim yet the Examiner only points to Olds at column 3, lines 55 - 65; Figure 4; column 8, lines 61 - 67; and column 9, lines 1 - 2 where Olds only teaches a password administrator being able to modify access privileges. Nowhere, however, does Olds teach first or second views, let alone those views that are copies of modified selection criteria. As the Applicant recites in claim 8 such views are presented to the at least one entity. Olds does not teach presentation of any such views. The Applicant, therefore, maintains that claim 14 is novel and nonobvious in view of the cited references and respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 14.

Claims 15, 16, and 18-20

Claim 15 recites a system for providing limited access to address entries in a directory in a shared environment. The system includes a network server configured for receiving and processing queries from entities for accessing directory information over at least one data network and performing functions with regards to accessing associated directories. The system also includes a shared directory in communication with the server which includes a plurality of address entries, each of the address entries including hierarchal information in an additional field, the hierarchal information being associated

with at least one entity of the entities having access to the shared directory. The system further includes the network server further configured to search the shared directory and, based on the queries, generate a first and at least one additional view of the at least one address entry, wherein access to the first view is restricted and the at least one additional view is a subset of the first view, wherein the at least one additional view provides access to the at least one entity to only those of the plurality of address entries in the first view which include the hierarchal information.

The Examiner rejected claim 15 for the same reasons as claim 8. Claim 15 recites a system that includes structure that may be configured to perform functions that are similar to those recited in claim 8. It is for at least these reasons that the arguments in favor of patentability for claim 8 apply herein as well. The Applicant, therefore respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 15.

Claim 16 and 18 - 20 depend from claim 15 and inherit all of the novel and nonobvious features of the independent claim. For at least these reasons, claim 16 and 18 - 20 are also novel and nonobvious in view of the cited references. However, these claims recite additional features that further distinguish from the cited references. For example, claim 18 recites that the server and directory are configured to provide posted emessaging services for a plurality of third parties. Such language is similar to that recited in claim 9. Accordingly, the arguments in favor of patentability for claim 9 apply herein as well. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 18.

As another example of patentable distinction, claim 19 recites that the first view comprises a listing of all entries and the at least one additional view is a copy of the listings of all entries with the modified search criteria. Such language was similarly recited in claim 14. Accordingly, the arguments in favor of patentability for claim 14 apply herein as well. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 14.

As yet another example of patentable distinction, claim 20 recites that fields of an address entry are provided for at least one of people entries and group entries in the directory. The Examiner once again points to Singhani to “pick and choose” isolated disclosures to supplement that which the other three cited references lacks, thereby

falling prey to impermissible hindsight. The Applicant maintains that claim 20 is novel and nonobvious in view of the cited references, either alone or in combination. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 20.

CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP

Date: 5-31-06

By: 

Gregory T. Fettig
Registration No. 50,843
3151 South Vaughn Way, Suite 411
Aurora, Colorado 80014
(720) 562-5509